

Remarks

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 16, 2008. In light of the following remarks, withdrawal of the pending rejections and advancement of this application to allowance are requested.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-10, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 34, 35, 37, and 42

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-10, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 34, 35, 37, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui et al. ("Interoperability of Peer-to-Peer File Sharing Protocols," August 2002) ("Lui") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,206,304 to Low et al. ("Low"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, in part, receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request for access to document stored on a first computer system, and replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location.

Claim 1 therefore requires that the second computer both (i) receive the request for access including the user-friendly handle, and (ii) replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location.

The Office Action admits Lui does not disclose or suggest replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location. For the following reasons, Low does not overcome the shortcomings of Lui.

As noted in the Action, Low discloses resolving a name or number string with an IP address using a Domain Name System (DNS) of the Internet. See Low, column 5, lines 35-42; column 10, lines 62-65; and column 13, line 60 through column 14, line 36; and FIG. 6. The resolution in Low is not implemented by the same computer that implements a user interface that receives the request for access to documents. See *id.* Instead, the resolution, including the substitution of the name for the IP address, is done by a separate DNS server. For example, Figure 11 of Low shows that a DNS lookup requires a separate query over the Internet 50 to a DNS server.

As such, Low fails to disclose or suggest resolution of a domain name by the same computer that receives the request. In contrast, claim 1 requires replacing the user-friendly handle at the second computer system, on which the user interface is implemented.

The Office Action states that the resolution of the IP address using the DNS server does affect implementation of a user interface that allows an input request for access to documents on another computer. Action, pp. 2-3. However, this statement fails to address the noted distinction between Low and claim 1 – in Low, the resolution is done by a separate entity (a DNS server), while claim 1 requires that the resolution be performed by the same second computer that implements the user interface. The Action fails to identify any disclosure in Low that would suggest such a configuration.

Therefore, neither Lui nor Low, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all limitations of claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 3, 5, and 6 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

Claim 7 recites, in part, resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request for access to documents, wherein the request is made to the publishing node from a user of the accessing node via a user interface stored on the accessing node. Claim 7 is therefore allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 7, as well as claims 9 and 10 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Claim 23 recites, in part, receiving at a user interface implemented on a second computer system a request from a second user of the second computer system to access a first document stored on a first computer system; and amending at the second computer system the request to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system. Claim 23 is therefore allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 23, as well as claims 25, 28, and 29 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Claim 30 recites, in part, a user interface module configured to enable a user of a first computer system to access and control a name resolution module, which intercepts requests for access to documents stored on a second computer system and amends each request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location. Claim 30 is therefore allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 30, as well as claims 32 and 34 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Claim 35 recites, in part, receiving at a user interface implemented on the accessing computer system instructions from a user of the accessing computer system to generate a request for access to documents; and amending at the accessing computer system the request to replace the user-friendly handle with the machine location. Claim 35 is therefore allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 35, as well as claims 37 and 42 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

B. Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26-27, 33-34, and 38-41

Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26-27, 33-34, and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,782,847 to Boyle et al. (“Boyle”). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26-27, 33-34, and 38-41 depend from claims 1, 7, 23, 30, and 35, respectively. Boyle fails to remedy the shortcomings of Lui and Low noted above. Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26-27, 33-34, and 38-41 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as those provide above for claims 1, 7, 23, 30, and 35. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

C. Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36

Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,587 to Huitema et al. (“Huitema”). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36 depend from claims 1, 7, 23, 30, and 35, respectively. Huitema fails to remedy the shortcomings of Lui and Low noted above. Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as those provide above for claims 1, 7, 23, 30, and 35. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

II. Conclusion

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: October 15, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/  
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky  
Reg. No.: 50,471